



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

names from those submitted, an equal number being chosen from each group. The sum total from the three groups should at least equal the number of voting delegates sent by the government. As that number is not yet decided on, the number of the people's delegates would for some time remain uncertain. But the first choice from each group, and as many of the others as possible, should, directly after nomination, proceed to intensive study of the intricate and technical matters that must be understood in order not to defeat the very purposes that they have in view. The tactics of the present enemy at the peace settlement will be quite as shrewd as they have been during the war. The people's delegates must understand in advance all that the Central Powers are likely to present as regards the historic and other claims that must be considered in all territorial adjustments. They should at once be given special opportunities for information, and in all matters of detail be given a free hand. Only in broad, general outline should the body of doctrine above referred to prescribe their action.

With reasonable speed, in two months after the recommendation of this plan was acted upon by the lower House the nomination and election should be complete. Is there any better way in which to secure the co-operation of the governments and the silent masses and the representation of those interests which no partisan political bodies ever represent? Nothing would preclude unlimited suggestions and advice being offered to the nominating boards which meet in three groups. Every one who had anything to offer could send a telegram or letter. The will of the people could be much more clearly expressed than by ordinary political convention for nomination and a vote based on congressional districts.

The above is respectfully suggested as a feasible and not costly plan. If there is another which presents more advantages, will its advocate please present it?

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

ARNOLD BENNETT in England and M. Gauvin in France have both protested lately against the habit of the Allied press of scorning or sneering at German peace proposals without any just consideration of them. Mr. Bennett fears mostly that this habit will result in a possible and trustworthy proposal creeping into the news some day only to be disregarded. M. Gauvin's objection would seem more securely founded, in that he condemns a practice which only aids Germany in convincing her people that the Allies will not listen to reason. Moreover, M. Gauvin criticizes the Allies for not stating boldly and unmistakably, without any ambiguous rhetorical flourishes, the plain fundamental bases of the peace they will accept. He points out that Germany is a specialist in omitting fundamentals and confining herself to detailed particulars. The Allies have here a tremendous advantage, since their conscience is clear and they can state, if they will, their past, present and future intentions in language that even the Kultur-bred Teuton can comprehend.

. . . "Tante Voss," or *Vossische Zeitung*, the beldame of the Berlin press, came out recently with its own version of Germany's peace terms. It conceded the full and free restoration of Belgian national independence. It allowed some modification of French and Italian boundaries, provided France, Italy, Germany and Austria were permitted to come to their own terms in this matter, with no outside intervention. It demanded (1) the return of all German colonies, (2) the restoration and return of all overseas rights and property of German merchants, (3) the unconditional evacuation by Great Britain of all parts of Turkey and Persia, (4) the *status quo ante bellum* in Egypt. An additional provision related to the free passage of the Dardanelles for Russian shipping.

. . . It is a matter of interest that a recent report on industrial settlements in England involves in its recommendations practically every principle involved in the program of the American Peace Society, and that it unmistakably repudiates enforced arbitration as unsuccessful in avoiding conflicts in wartime and less likely to do so in time of peace. The document is the supplementary report of the Whitley Committee on the Relations between Employers and Employed, published under the direction of the Minister of Reconstruction, Dr. Addison. The pronouncement against compulsory arbitration is extended to include schemes of conciliation providing for a suspension by force of a strike or lock-out pending an inquiry. Maintenance of the present machinery for voluntary conciliation and arbitration is strongly urged, with the view of the setting up of Joint Industrial Councils and the proposal to maintain permanent arbitration councils on the lines of the present temporary Committee on Production. To this latter council disputants would voluntarily submit their claims for decision where decision between themselves proved impossible. It is further proposed that the standing arbitration council should take means to secure the co-ordination of arbitrators' decisions. The committee are opposed to the enforcement of awards and agreements by means of monetary penalties.

. . . The principle of the freedom of subject nationalities to choose their own government is being applied at home by the Allies, as well as advocated abroad. India is the latest to benefit in this manner, or to be on the road to it, through the plan of limited home rule achieved by the Secretary for India, Mr. Edwin S. Montagu, and Baron Chelmsford, Viceroy and Governor General of India. This plan does not make the mistake of bestowing absolute unrestraint upon the as yet too unsophisticated possessors of a tremendously rich country. The aim is to give India as much freedom as, so to speak, it can absorb, with the ultimate aim of responsible self-government. The present proposal, which goes before the British Parliament for authentication, provides for (1) provincial legislatures, to be composed of directly elected representatives; (2) a vice-regal legislature for all India, to be composed of two chambers—the legislative assembly and the council of state; (3) an Indian privy council of which the members are to be appointed by the King, and (4) a council of

princes. In addition, certain local subjects are to come under the jurisdiction of executive councils of the provinces, of which each is composed of the Governor and two members, one native. The first of the four main bodies will be chosen on "as broad a franchise as possible." The legislative assembly will be two-thirds elective and one-third appointed by the Governor General—inverse proportions to the former plan. The council of state, which is planned to form a group of "elder statesmen," with whom will rest the final legislative responsibility in important affairs, will have twenty-one elected members and twenty-nine appointed. The council of princes will consider questions affecting the native states and those of concern either to the empire as a whole or to British India and the native states in common. The plan provides for a complete resurvey of the whole political situation ten years after the original plan has been put into effect, with the idea of conveying, where possible, still more power into the hands of the natives. Similar investigations are to take place subsequently at intervals of not less than twelve years.

. . . According to Lord Robert Cecil, British Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Minister of Blockade, an economic league exists today, to all intents and purposes, between the twenty-four nations forming the Entente Allies. The great question is whether or not Germany can be admitted to that league after the war. This rests, in the opinion of Lord Cecil, upon whether the German people, in the words of President Wilson, "continue to live under ambitious and intriguing masters interested to disturb the peace of the world." The principles of the economic league Lord Cecil cleverly borrows from the statements of our President, advocating "the removal so far as possible of all economic barriers, and the establishment of an equality of trade among all the nations consenting to peace and associating themselves for its maintenance." Lord Cecil voices the loyal assent of the Entente Allies to these principles, but finds that they do not, "of course," mean that there shall be no protective tariffs nor international competition after the war. The application of these principles, as Lord Cecil expresses it, gives a perfect picture of all the nations being fine and noble in sentiment and extremely self-protective and cautious in fact, or, in his own words, "each member of the association of nations may have to protect its citizens in one way or another after the war, but our aim must be a comprehensive arrangement of liberal intercourse with all members of the association."

. . . "I have no doubt that in the course of the next few weeks Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Newfoundland, which have all contributed their share of sacrifice and are entitled to an equal voice with the representatives of these islands, will determine the conditions under which we are prepared to make peace," said Lloyd-George to a group of Canadian editors July 13. "Unless I am mistaken we are pretty much in agreement on them. There must be no 'hugger-mugger' peace. It must be a real peace. The god of brute force must, this time and forever, be broken and burnt in its own furnace."

. . . The danger of allowing Allied troops to come into conflict with Russians is stressed by the military commission of Russians now in Paris. Japanese and United States troops, with whatever of the Entente forces may be sent to join them, may profitably engage German detachments, but for them to come into conflict with Bolsheviks would result in a prejudice spreading abroad that would, in these Russians' estimation, undo any work they might accomplish. They point out that in France there are Polish and Russian troops, and that these might be combined with the Czechoslovaks now in possession of stretches of the Trans-Siberian Railroad, with Slavs elsewhere in the Allied countries and in Russia and Siberia. These troops could operate with far more telling effect against their fellow-Slavs, since race, and even national prejudice, would here function as a deteriorating force among the pro-German Russians, rather than engender bitterness that would only confuse the issue.

. . . Regarding the now fairly determined plans for intervention in Russian affairs one editor remarks, in effect, that, after all, intervention is as intervention does, and by any other name would smell as sourly were it to violate the principles for which the Allies have declared. The same writer points out that the intervention is in reality the same which the United States and Great Britain have extended to France—defense of sovereignty, with no ulterior project in view. It is not explained, however, as it has never been explained in the case of the growling, tail-wagging dog, whether Russia understands this matter as thoroughly as every one else does.

. . . The "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" in the Russian situation are troublesome enough, and the evidence upon which to base a decision to intervene or not to intervene is sufficiently confusing to make the Allies as melancholy on this subject as was ever Shakespeare's Dane. On one side bourgeois leaders declare that "all Russia save the Bolsheviks" want the Allies in Russia. This even is the cry of the well-known revolutionary leader Bourzoff. "If I write as I do," he declares in the Paris *Matin*, "it is because I am certain that apart from the Bolsheviks all the Russians, Socialists or bourgeois, think as I do; for we are all certain that the allied army, from whatever direction it comes, will have no other aim than the reorganization of Russia, the resurrection of Russia to strength and independence. The landing of an Allied army on our soil will prepare the alliance which will come after the war. The technical genius of France, of England, of America, will aid us in making the most of our great national resources. But let it not be forgotten that no co-operation will be possible until after the downfall of the Bolsheviks." Maxim Gorky, still better known here as Socialist editor and leader and as an ultra-revolutionist, takes the same side, urging that the progress of the Bolsheviks is the sweeping on through Russia of the forces of demoralization and disintegration. Telling of female slave markets instituted in the Crimea, he says: "Official assurances state that we are entering the Kingdom of Communism, where complete equality is to reign among

men, where bourgeois property is to be known no more, and where the power of chattels is non-existent. What is really happening is the transformation of human beings into chattels, pre-bourgeois property in human beings is being restored, and the soldiers of the revolutionary army are publicly trading in slaves, as the planters did in the time of Mrs. Beecher-Stowe." Mr. Nabokoff, representative in London of the late Provisional Government of Russia, is urging those who will listen to him to influence public opinion towards invasion. He refers to the liberated peasantry as man-sized, sullen children given suddenly the power of demi-gods. He, however, recognizes the difficulty of the Allies in attempting to assist Russia, since an unwise action would result in accelerating rather than preventing the progress of German influence in the country. He hopes that "an authoritative body" of Russians, representing truly the majority of the people, may bid for the Allies' aid, and that then the Allies may be prepared to give it promptly and efficaciously.

. . . On the other side of the Russian fence, the *Isvestia*, official organ of the Central Soviet Executive Committee, in a series of articles, has warned the Allies against any untoward attempt to interfere. The whole Russian people, although too weak to remonstrate, would, it declares, regard such a disregard of the sovereignty of the new government with the deepest hate and aversion and would never consent to be reconciled to the violators and usurpers. Russia, it adds, is quite willing to pit one imperialistic power against another, and so save herself from the depredations of either, and is willing to employ the Allies against Germany in this manner, and will do so if Germany presses the necessity; but this is not to be considered in any light as the same sort of intervention for which the Russian bourgeoisie appeals, which is intended to crush the power of the Soviets. The Bolsheviks ask for the present only that the Allies will acknowledge the absolute power of the Soviet government in Russia, and believe that the Soviets cannot be an ally or agent of the German military party. It is time, says *Isvestia*, that the Allies' ambassadors evacuated their residences at Vologda and entered into useful business relations with the Council of Commissioners of the People.

. . . The facts about Finland have been even more difficult to ascertain from available news than are those of Russia proper. On the one side, the "Reds" declare that the White Guards have sold the country to Germany, with whom they have been dickering for several years, and that considering this the lack of restraint in the "Reds'" procedures is at least partially excusable. On the other side, the "White Finns" aver eloquently that they have no dealings with Germany and no wish for future close relations with Germany, beyond the necessary help for which they were compelled to call when 14,000 red-handed Bolsheviks were sent into the country to pillage it and when Russia and then Sweden refused to respond to their appeals, first for justice, lastly for protection. Santeri Nuorteva, representative in the United States of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Finland, writes to the *Christian Science*

Monitor that the White Guards are "composed mostly of hired thugs and strike-breakers, armed with German weapons and officered by the 'Finnish chasseurs' trained in the army of the Kaiser." Three gentlemen who secured endorsement of their letter to the *New York Times* by P. J. Valkeapaa, "Special Representative to the United States and Canada of the Finland Constitutional Government Food Administration," refer to the Red Guard as "organized hooligans." Who are the real pro-Germans in Finland, they ask, if not "those who, by rising in arms to force their own selfish aims upon the community, and calling in Russian armed help against their own legally elected government, brought about the eventual intervention of Germany?" They declare that the working class of Finland is highly organized and developed, and that the best part of this class has either backed the "White Government" or preserved, where possible, neutrality. They assert that Finnish opinion, definitely and frequently expressed, renders impossible any conception of Finland, under any rule, becoming a monarchy, either under a German prince, or any other.

. . . The new Siberian provisional government, according to dispatches from Harbin, Manchuria, includes General Horvath, Premier; Mr. Taskin, Minister of Agriculture; Mr. Vostrotin, Minister of Commerce; Mr. Ustrugoff, Minister of Communication; Mr. Putloff, Minister of Finance; General Flug, Minister of War. The appointments are described as being temporary. General Horvath has issued a proclamation announcing his program, which comprises the following: Abolition of all Bolshevik laws; restoration of legal tribunals and administrative institutions, and self-government by municipalities and zemstvos; equality at law of citizens and maintenance of citizen rights and liberties; the general right of election; recognition of former alliances, conventions, and agreements with allied and neutral countries, also political obligations and proprietary rights of territory; restoration of the army with strictest discipline, without giving the army political rights; restoration of private property ownership; land questions to be decided by a constituent assembly; restoration of commerce and trade by abolishing nationalization and socialization of commercial and industrial organizations; improvement of popular education; freedom of religion; right of Siberia and other regions to autonomy as a part of a United Russia.

. . . The pity which some of us urge upon the rest of us for the poor Bulgars, yoked in serfdom to Prussia and led about by the nose by Ferdinand and his followers, may find abatement in the recent news of Bulgaria's part in the somewhat mixed politics of the Near East today. Since the Dobrudja was drawn and quartered by Prussia, and technically equally distributed to all four of the Central Powers, press reports indicate that all is not well. Austria and Germany compassionately gave over their shares of the Dobrudja to Bulgaria in return for some not clearly specified but evidently important concessions. Turkey, since the major share of the plunder went to Bulgaria, asked the return of a small portion of territory along the Maritza River

which had been Turkey's up to May, 1915, but then had been turned over to Bulgaria. This Bulgaria has offered to yield, but on terms evidently distasteful to Turkey. While the matter was still unsettled, Austria and Germany were holding back the northern quarters of the Dobrudja. Bulgaria, meanwhile, after the despoiling of Rumania, from whom the Dobrudja is taken, has objected violently to the alliance of Bessarabia to Rumania, which was reported in these columns last month. In contrast with the statement that the people of Bulgaria do not share in these rapacious policies of their rulers, it may be interesting to note, in a recent issue of the Sofia paper *Kambana*, one of the party leaders, Mr. Todoroff, saying: "The whole Bulgarian nation stands behind the government. The throwing in of compensations for the Bulgarian Dobrudja cannot be taken seriously, because all our Allies stand to receive much more than we. Take for instance the Turks.

... Can there be any question of equilibrium and surrender?" Meanwhile the Radoslavoff cabinet is out and all available reports claim this is due to the fact that under its management Bulgaria did not appear to be getting all that might be coming to her. The Serbs claim that no government in Europe has a more whole-hearted support from its people than has the Bulgarian. British critics declare that Bulgaria will never be appeased till she is supreme in the Balkans. Bulgarian editors are declaring that Turkey, Bulgaria's ally, must be driven out of Europe.

... Of some direct interest to us in all this is the statement of Todoroff, quoted above, that, while American intervention in the war was negligible from a military point of view, it would have considerable importance at the eventual peace conference. This being so, Mr. Todoroff congratulated himself on the facts that Bulgaria had formerly enjoyed the sympathies of Americans, and that she is now at peace with the United States. These, in his opinion, indicate clearly that Bulgaria may count on American support for her demands when the final terms are drawn up.

... An Austro-Hungarian paper, *Primorske Novine*, appeared lately with striking accounts of the Bulgarian terrorization of the Serbs. "He who dares to say he is a Serb is lost," the paper declares of the districts of old Serbia and the Pomoravlje now occupied by a Bulgarian military administration. Outside of the "ordinary" devastation and destruction, the effort to destroy every syllable and every memory of Serbian language is said to be phenomenal. Children may not bear their Serbian names. Also it is stated that under compulsion signatures are being widely secured declaring that the inhabitants are Bulgarian. Where these are refused it is discovered that the rebel is a dangerous criminal, and he is dealt with accordingly.

... Four ministers representing the Entente Powers presented a note to the Rumanian Government in May protesting that the Bucharest Treaty contains clauses contravening international agreements and conventions, and announcing that the four powers consider as non-existent any arrangements made independently of them regarding the navigation of the Danube, since this ques-

tion is one that can only be settled by agreement between all the powers interested.

... Had the framers of the Bucharest treaty between the Central Powers and Rumania tried, as it may safely be said they did not, to please everybody, they could have scarcely pleased fewer persons. Such is the contention of a prominent Pan German, Herr von Graefe, in the *Deutsche Zeitung*. He enumerates the following four "holes" in the treaty, wailing that with "one or two more such peace treaties we are lost."

"First—Austria-Hungary has received by frontier rectifications the lion's share of the most valuable Rumanian territory, and not our enemies, but we, have to shoulder our billions of war debt.

"Second—The petroleum agreement is an absolute swindle. By it the banks profit and not the German people, who will have to pay dearly for their oil.

"Third—We get Rumanian grain at usury prices, of which the Rumanian treasury is sure to grab the main part by way of export duties, so it is we who pay an indemnity to Russia.

"Fourth—The dynastic question and the position of Jews in Rumania are dealt with on the basis of the Berlin treaty of 1878, when self-determination and rights of conquered states had not been invented."

... A large pro-Rumanian meeting was held some weeks ago in Rome, and was attended by representatives of the government, Senators and Deputies, and various political associations. It was resolved that Italo-Rumanian relations were not affected by the "peace" forced upon Italy's fellow Latin by the Central Powers. The Society of the Rumanians of Transylvania and Bukowina, through its president, sent from Rome about this time a message of gratitude and loyalty to King Ferdinand of Bulgaria, expressing the debt due the King for his courageous entrance upon the war, on behalf of the non-Magyar and non-German nationalities of Austria-Hungary, and declaring that the peace treaty forced upon him did not abate that gratitude nor dispel the hope of a greater and a free Rumania after the war, wrought with the assistance of "her great allies." An Italian, Prof. Pietro Silva, has pointed out in the *Corriere della Sera*, of Rome, that this claim of Rumania for the territories inhabited by her brothers in Transylvania, now under Magyar domination, constitutes a bond of common end and purpose between Italy and Rumania. He urges that Italy, as well as the other Entente Powers, declare definitely that the claims Rumania has made for her rights in the final settlement shall be maintained.

... A frequent correspondent to *Il Secolo*, of Rome, upon Rumanian matters, who signs himself "Junius," has recently attempted to prove that the German assent to the union of Bessarabia to Rumania was not and could not be from any desire to propitiate Rumania for the loss of the Dobrudja, but solely because the resultant hostility aroused among the Russians towards the Rumanians is a necessary ingredient in Germany's European patent medicine. "Junius" states that while the majority of the population is Rumanian, the Russian element has left a deep impress in Bessarabia, especially in the cities, so that Germany has hopes of a reverse *revanche* working out decidedly in her favor.

. . . Articles in French, Flemish, Belgian and Dutch papers of late are said to be the beginnings of a German "smoke screen" preparatory to a division of Belgium based upon the prostitution of both Holland and France. The articles in the main discuss with reasoned calm the "remote" possibilities of Belgium's fate. French articles, if not inspired by Germany, at least chiming in admirably with what are declared to be her plans, dilate upon the advantage of a close alliance between Belgium, France and Italy. Belgian articles treat of the inevitable dependence of Belgium on Germany, owing to the Rhine traffic. Meanwhile in Holland a "Greater Netherlands" movement is creeping up. *De Telegraaf* of Amsterdam takes occasion to link all these together and to point out their lack of point except to pave the way for a Meuse boundary between France and Holland, with Belgium non-existent. Germany's scheme would be to separate the Walloons from Flanders, as she has steadily attempted to do. The Walloon districts would then be given to France as a bribe for peace, and the Flanders districts turned over to Holland with a generosity which Holland would return by becoming Germany's doorway to the North Sea and the northern link in the *Mitteleuropa* chain to be flung across Europe.

. . . Baron Burian's assertion that the Allies' statement of principles differs little from that of Germany and Austria, and that President Wilson's four proposals of July 4 are perfect in theory and as such quite agreeable to the Central Powers, although unfortunately they cannot be applied as Mr. Wilson would wish, is well known. In the same message to the Austrian and Hungarian Premiers he reveals what our proposals sound like on the other side of the Rhine and along the Danube. He finds only three main aims: (1) a league of free nations pledged to arbitration; (2) no domination of one nation by another; (3) "various territorial changes to be carried out at the expense of the Central Powers." He notes also the evident intention to destroy Austria-Hungary by disintegration. "We are prepared to discuss everything," he declares, "except our own territory," referring to Alsace-Lorraine, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Trieste, the Trentino and the German colonies in China and Africa. With regard to the occupied territory he is apparently in agreement with Chancellor von Hertling, who said in the Reichstag on July 13: "The present possession of Belgium only means that we have a pawn for future negotiations."

. . . The military pact between Austria and Germany, quoted here last month, has, of course, been supplemented by more than a few political and economic agreements. The press reports a decided demand at a recent conference in Vienna for a strong German council to control the affairs of both countries with absolute unity, as the last weapon of hope for the Central Powers. Regulations to aid this council, as suggested, included the imposition of German as the official and only publicly tolerated language throughout Austria; the creation of a strong centralized administration to care for the interests of German minorities in Bohemia and Moravia; the stamping out of all movements towards racial independence within the Dual Monarchy, or nationalistic

aspirations among the subject peoples, and shrewd efforts to unite Magyar, Pole, and German in a bond of mutual understanding. It is also reported that the method most favored in Austria for wrecking the hopes of the Jugoslavs is to foster open rebellion at this time, when it may yet be successfully crushed. The Jugoslavs, although said to be on the verge of revolution, adopt a waiting policy and endeavor to hold back any desire for immediate rising, until the chances of success are more numerous.

. . . One editorial writer, commenting on the changing policy among the Allied Powers towards the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, notes the curious predisposition in Austria's favor that has always lurked about the bureau of the British Foreign Office, and which this country also, in a measure, seemed to manifest. It has been practically impossible for a good many years, declares the editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*, for Britain to see the Germans of Austria as Germans. "Even after the present war began," he adds, "Downing Street insisted on separating Vienna from Berlin, and it has taken the worst indications of Austrian enmity finally to break the image stored on the shelves of the Foreign Office, and bring Downing Street to the point of seriously considering the disintegration of the Austrian Empire as a possibility. A year ago Downing Street was probably as completely committed to the theory of Austria's integrity as it has always been understood Washington was. Within the last few months, however, events have followed each other in so rapid a succession that Downing Street has been compelled at last to reconsider its point of view as Washington must be rapidly forced to do. What has happened is extremely simple. The Königsplatz has not merely thrown away the scabbard of the sword of Middle-European conquest; it has gloried openly in its domination of Vienna as *criminis particeps*, and the young and weak Emperor Karl has been compelled to repudiate "My dear Sixtus," and permit himself to be bound to the wheels of the Königsplatz war chariot, rather in the guise of a captive taking part in a triumph than in that of an equal of the Kaiser. If, then, the Emperor Karl is going to prove to be as possessed of feet of clay as any Romanoff, and if the Hammer-God is going to rule the destinies of *Mitteleuropa*, the question has been forced at once on London, on Paris, on Washington, and even upon Rome, whether the policy of the integrity of the Austro-Hungarian Empire will not have to be given up, and the formation of a Jugoslav confederation have to be considered equally with that of a free Poland."

. . . The paragraph in the \$12,000,000 army appropriation bill signed by President Wilson early in July relating to the "Slavic legion," and which corresponds to the sanction and recognition that European Allies have given the fighting units of these peoples, reads as follows:

"Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, a force of volunteer troops in such unit or units as he may direct may be raised, to be composed of Jugo-Slavs, Czecho-Slovaks, and Ruthenians (Ukrainians) belonging to the oppressed races of the

Austro-Hungarian or German Empire resident in the United States, but not citizens thereof nor subject to the draft. Such force shall be known as the Slavic legion, or by such other description as the President may prescribe. No man shall be enlisted in it until he has furnished satisfactory evidence that he will faithfully and loyally serve the cause of the United States, and that he desires to fight the Imperial Governments of Germany and Austro-Hungary. The force so raised and duly sworn into the service may be equipped, maintained, and trained with our own troops or separated as the President may direct, and thereafter may be transported to such field of action as the President may direct to be used against the common enemy in connection with our own troops or with those of any nation associated with the United States in the present war; and the several items of expense involved in the equipment, maintenance, training, and transportation of such force may be paid from the respective appropriations herein made or from any subsequent appropriations for the same; provided that American citizens of Austrian or German birth, or who were born in alien enemy territory, who have passed the necessary examination and whose loyalty is unquestioned, may, in the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy, be commissioned in the United States army or navy."

. . . There are sufficient indications that Secretary Lansing's announcement of sympathy and encouragement for the Jugoslavs and Tzchoslovaks worked as leaven through the peoples of the oppressed races of Austria-Hungary. The Serbian Prime Minister, M. Pasic, has already notified Secretary Lansing that he "may rest assured that it will rouse the greatest enthusiasm and still further foment the spirit of revolution." An immediate consequence to this, M. Pasic predicts, will be a "recrudescence of the Austrian measures of repression, arrests, internments, shootings, and hangings. But these will have no effect on the Slav peoples." He calls the date of Secretary Lansing's declaration "a red-letter day in the history of the Jugoslav struggle for freedom." All Jugoslavs, he ventures, will henceforth look to this country as their champion in word and deed, and their preserver, not only morally, but politically and financially as well. Germans in Germany and Austria are declaring that the Greater Serbia must die, but meanwhile a Council of Twenty-four is being formed, we are told, and this within the boundaries of Austria-Hungary, whose aim is the consolidation of Jugoslavia and the proper advertising of its condition and purposes through the Allied press. While the Pan-German *Tagespost* of Graz is declaring that the Russian and Rumanian treaties with Germany constitute the defeat of the Greater Slav idea, a neighboring journal, the *Hrvatska Drzava*, urges that kingdoms and republics may rise or fall, but the Pan-Slav drive goes on forever.

. . . As given in the memorandum submitted last year by the Jugoslav Socialist party to the Dutch-Scandinavian Committee, which has now been published in pamphlet form, the territories occupied by the Jugoslavs are as follows:

I. In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

1. Croatia-Slavonia, area 42,534 sq. km., population, 2,621,954.

2. Dalmatia and the Dalmatian Islands, area, 12,835 sq. km., population, 700,000 (5% Italians).
3. Bosnia and Herzegovina, area, 51,199 sq. km., population, 1,938,808.
4. In the southeast of Hungary, 250,000 Jugoslavs.
5. Istria and the Quarnero Islands, area, 4,956 sq. km., population, 220,382 Jugoslavs and 145,525 Italians.
6. Carniola, Gorica, Carinthia, Styria and Southwestern Hungary, 1,500,000.

II. Outside the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

1. Serbia.
2. Montenegro.
3. Bulgaria.

III. Jugoslav emigrants in America, Asia and Africa to the number of 1,500,000.

. . . These same Jugoslav Socialists endeavored to make clear the servile condition of the Jugoslavs in their present circumstances, which in many instances appears to rival the by-gone ages of feudalism. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the report reads, 650,000 individuals, representing 112,000 families, work like beasts of burden for some 10,000 Mohammedan masters. "In Dalmatia," it continues, "the Jugoslav peasant languishes under the Latin form of serfdom, the state of the *colonati*. Finally, in the rest of the Jugoslav lands, we have the modern form of serfdom—the serfdom of the mortgage weighing down the rural masses; they are still paying off the price of their emancipation from serfdom, promulgated in 1848." Protest is made also against the German and Magyar custom of promoting emigration, systematically colonizing the districts so denuded of their rightful population.

. . . If reasons for the above-mentioned colonization of Jugoslavia by Germans and Magyars are not immediately perceptible, the Socialist report adds the fact that the Croatian and Slavonian territory is "the granary of the Balkans." These territories are described as rich in the wealth of the soil, and are said to form an economic unit as clearly defined as the racial unit of their peoples. The necessity that this wealth shall not pass to the spoilers of small peoples is stressed in the final declaration, which urges the political "axioms" of the Russian Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, and claims, in the name of their people and of the workers of the world, "that the Jugoslav nation also be granted the right to constitute itself into an independent State, from the economic and political viewpoint, a sovereign State invested with all the powers proper to it, so as to enable it to join the Republican Confederation of all the other Balkan States, and in future to serve the interests of universal peace to the utmost of its power in conformity with the decisions taken at the first inter-Balkan Socialist Conference, which we look upon as offering the only final possible solution of the Balkan problem in its entirety."

. . . What would seem a valuable contribution to the Jugoslav movement is an urgent plea on the part of the Roman paper *Unità* that the issues between Italy and Jugoslavia may be kept unmistakably clear. The two points of most confusion are, of course, Dalmatia and Istria. Want of a clear understanding between the two countries on these points, as well as a comprehension of them by the Allies, *Unità* points out, may result in a clever proposal on the part of Austria, when peace terms are broached, which cannot well be avoided by

Italy, and which will yet trap her into collusion with the Central Powers against the Southern Slavs, or trick her into a second Alsace-Lorraine sort of bargain, in which would grow the seeds of further war. *Unità* does not attempt to dictate in too exact terms what the understanding between the Slavs and Italians must be, but indicates generally its preference for a clear understanding that Dalmatia shall go to Jugoslavia, with eastern Istria, but that the major, western part of the Istrian peninsula shall be Italy's. "Slav nationalist propaganda sowing doubts as to Italian rights to Istria," the paper adds, "prevents public opinion in the allied countries from forming a sound judgment on the matter. Her friends in France and England should prevent the Slav nationalists from bringing about a state of things which would compass their own undoing and that of others," since an Istria unclaimed by Italy from Austria would, in *Unità*'s opinion, be the keystone out of the arch of Southern Slav freedom.

. . . Two events have brought Poland into the news of late, each as characteristic perhaps of the real nature the European War is coming to assume as any happening could well be. One is the "fourth partition" of Poland by Germany and Austria at the May conference, by which, according to Tzech reports, the upper half, or thereabouts, is designated as German, and the balance goes to Austria, to be united with Galicia and to form a triple instead of a dual monarchy. The second event is the presentation of flags by President Poincaré of France to the first Polish division on the French front, these the gifts of Paris, Verdun, Nancy and Belfort. In his address on this occasion President Poincaré referred to President Wilson's declaration in favor of an independent Poland, and to the decision of the Versailles conference that Poland, in order to have full development, must have access to the sea. The flags presented were caught together with the Croix de Guerre.

. . . The influence and power of a free Bohemia in relation to its neighbors is the interesting topic of an article appearing not long ago in the new Roman journal *La Voce dei Popoli*, as written by Edward Benes, a Tzechoslovak leader now operating among the Allies. Twelve million Tzechoslovaks occupy fairly densely some 140,000 square kilometers of territory. Formed into a State, he says, this district would touch Poland on the north and Jugoslavia on the south (the ethnological map does not support the latter statement by some hundred or so miles). It would thus be a complete bar to any *Mitteleuropa* scheme, and accordingly involve a regroupment of the Central European States. Bohemia would naturally be thrown into close allegiance with Poland, with which nation it would have a long frontier in common. They would be the natural allies of France, and would form, with Jugoslavia, a barrier of support and protection to the slowly developing New Russia. The economic strength of this triumvirate would be strengthened by two outlets to the sea, Trieste to the south and Dantzig to the north. Alliance to Rumania would be inevitable, further strengthening the barrier, and including Black Sea ports available.

These countries are of such a character as to weld themselves naturally through interchange of mutually desired products, as, for example, Bohemia would exchange its manufactured wares for Rumania's food products. An important consideration, M. Benes states, is the growing understanding between Italy and the Southern Slavs. Relations with Austria and the Magyars would be largely determined by the facts that the new Slav block would reach its boundaries to within forty miles of Vienna and to within fifteen or twenty miles of Budapest, and that Hungary, so shorn, would be little more than an agricultural State. These freshly grouped States of Central Europe, he adds, would represent a real Society of Nations.

. . . The twenty-second nation to declare war on Germany is Haiti, whose council of state, in accordance with the legislative powers granted it by the new Haitian Constitution, unanimously voted in July the declaration of war against Germany requested by President d'Artiguenave. The twenty-third is Honduras.

. . . The American Red Cross has recently issued a statement repudiating the assertion spread in Germany that it made a practice of letting Germans go uncared-for. To the American Minister at Berne the American Red Cross has sent, via the State Department, the declaration that "The American Red Cross knows no such thing as the nationality of a wounded man. Any wounded enemy turned over to the care of the American Red Cross will receive as kindly treatment as any friend."

. . . In charge of the bureau of the Committee on Public Information at Harbin, Manchuria, an important point on the trans-Siberian railway is Mr. Malcolm W. Davis, formerly an Assistant Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE. Since January, 1917, Mr. Davis has been in active and continuous service, first with the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A. in the Kazan district of Russia, later with the Russian Branch of the Committee on Public Information at Petrograd, Moscow and Irkutsk. As a reward for his work in Russia and Siberia Mr. Davis was in May called from Peking to take his present important post at Harbin.

. . . A writer to the *Christian Science Monitor* writes to protest against the too indulgent treatment afforded the conscientious objector to military service. The President's order that those who refused even non-combatant service should be segregated and not required to perform any work has been strictly obeyed. This, the critic states, has resulted in things "going from bad to worse"—owing to advantage being taken of this opportunity by others than those who in conscience could not aid the country in its need. He sums the present situation up as follows:

- (1.) The conscientious objector (slacker) doesn't have to belong to any sect.
- (2.) He doesn't have to believe in anything.
- (3.) All this slacker has to do is to object and refuse to work, and he lives like a queen bee.
- (4.) Army officers at cantonments are not now al-

lowed even to try one of them for disobedience of orders unless:

- (a.) The traitorous slacker is sullen.
- (b.) He is insincere.
- (c.) He is engaged in open propaganda.

. . . Mexican labor is made available in our Western States, according to careful provisions drawn up by the Department of Labor, by which peons are admitted across the border on direct representation of the employer, must be paid wages according to the prevailing market for similar help, and are to be returned to the border when their season's work are over. To aid in enforcing the third provision, twenty-five cents a day of the laborer's pay must be deposited in the United States Postal Savings Bank, to be returned to him at the border on his return to Mexico.

JOINING THE ISSUE

Trenton, N. J., July 24, 1918.

To the Editor:

SIR: The two editorials in the July ADVOCATE OF PEACE, "Force and a League of Nations" and "Another League to Enforce Peace," the latter containing the proposal of Mr. McCurdy, lead me to utter a few words of comment along the line of my article in the ADVOCATE for June, 1917. I cordially agree with Mr. McCurdy that no war except defensive war can ever be justified by any rational standard of right and wrong. I marvel that there is any thought that the purpose of the League to Enforce Peace is contrary to such views as Mr. McCurdy's. I have previously urged that nations forming such a league should be only such as have confidence in each other. Nations whose people have accepted the idea so well put forth by Mr. McCurdy would show such confidence, and would not deliberately arm against each other. If the league which they should form should be sufficiently inclusive of the powerful nations, they would not need to arm extensively against the potential enemies outside the league. Practical disarmament would therefore come about by a perfectly natural process.

The criticism that I have found in the ADVOCATE, that the announced platform of the League to Enforce Peace contemplates war as a possible resource to enforce rights—though not necessarily a defensive war—is just from the standpoint of inculcating correct ideas and standards. But to my mind, the all-important thing today is to induce as many persons as possible in all countries to think in terms of a league of nations which shall interpose its combined power to prevent any one national government from inaugurating an aggressive war without having first submitted its grievances, if any, to an international council of some sort. With the thinking of the peoples once engaged with this idea, it should be easy to take a step forward to an express formulation of Mr. McCurdy's expression as the explicit platform of the league. To ask that a nation preclude itself from resort to arms to enforce its claims under all circumstances is to furnish material for such "Arguments" as former Senator Beveridge advanced in his Memorial Day address.

I think the program of the League to Enforce Peace should be welcomed as the Emancipation Proclamation was welcomed, although it left slavery untouched in the border

States not in rebellion. Though partial in its operation, it was complete in its inevitable ultimate effect.

The "super-force" of public opinion could be counted on to convert the league into one embodying the McCurdy idea, and the change would not be likely to be long delayed.

Very truly yours,

LINTON SATTERTHWAITE.

Rochester, N. Y., July 28, 1918.

To the Editor:

SIR: It is well that young and old should dream dreams and see visions, but there comes ere long, however honestly spun our fancies, an incursive and destructive moment of decision or action, which might well be called a "brass-tack interval" or interlude in the dreams of men. The idiosyncrasies of sleepers vary, and so of dreamers rudely wakened in the night, or dinned from sleep by cockcrow. Coming down to brass tacks, in other words, is a feat not performed by all with equal grace. These reflections, and others with which I would not bore you, are bestirred by the July issue of your paper, containing as it does much pro and con a league, alliance, association or otherwise, of nations.

The Enforce-peacers, now, are dreamers of the heavy, slumbrous type, well-bedded in conscious virtue, mouth agape, trumpeting inarticulate defiance. Do you think your mild aspersions will awaken them? Not a bit! Think how deep is their sleep, how fantastic their dream! Some twenty-five nations that have never trusted each other, have never until today allied themselves in any workable alliance, except through fear or greed, would now be chattering, cheating, grabbing, taking sly advantage of each other, suspecting, condemning, bluffing each other, if it were not for the fact that the colossal stupidity of four nations has forced them to learn the elements of trust, brotherhood, idealism. These, forsooth, are now to come sweetly together and bind themselves to keep the peace forever and a day—these young Galahads of nations are to confess themselves so pure and spotless that they will let any man be their judge, and executioner. These noble Samurai are to agree to commit national hara-kiri rather than draw the sword in anger and without counting ten. This piquant program of the League to Enforce Peace is a side-splitting farce—and if reason will not wake them from it, the laughter of the plain people all over the world will eventually turn them out of bed. And this is so because their proposal is, in essence, a proposal to return to the *status quo ante*, and it is far funnier for the people of America or England to propose such a thing than it is for poor wool-witted Toto II of Germany to do so.

The Enforce-peacers want to return to the *status quo ante*—not perhaps geographically speaking, nor politically speaking, no, certainly not. But morally speaking, yes. They want a court, perhaps a legislature, for the whole world; but who are the members of the court? Are they chastened peoples, nations new-visioned, Governments humbled and ready to be shown? No, for such peoples, nations, Governments, do not rush into agreements to cut each other's throats if a rough word is passed without apology. The Enforce-peacers have no use for nations with a new vision. They have no use for moral terms of peace. They want their good old rowdy crowd of nations, good-hearted in a brutal way at their best; at their average a gang of boodlers, thugs, brawlers, cheats, boasters, bruisers. They want the crowd that let the bully of Europe keep the